		Page 1
1	(Whereupon, the deposition began at ^	9
2	^ a.m. ^ p.m.) 8:30	
3	VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the record for	
4	the deposition of Dr. Roger Tourangeau. Today is	
5	April 8th, 2009. The time is 8:30 a.m. counsel	MA0E:80
6	please identify yourselves for the Record.	
7	MR. DEIHL: This is Colin Deihl here on	
8	behalf of Cargill.	
9	MR. HIXON: Phillip Hixon on behalf of	
10	Peterson Farms.	08:31AM
11	MS. XIDIS: Claire Xidis for the State of	
12.	Oklahoma.	
13	MS. MOLL: Ingrid Moll for the State of	
14	Oklahoma.	
15	WITNESS	
16	having first been duly sworn to testify the truth,	
17	the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified	:
18	as follows:	
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
20	BY ^	08:31AM
21	Q Please state your name for the Record.	
22	A Roger Tourangeau.	
23	Q And what is your home and work address, Dr.	
24	Tourangeau?	
25	A I live at 237 Amberly Drive, Silver Spring,	08:31AM

## ROUGH DRAFT, ROGER TOURANGEAU, 4-9-09

_		Page 52
1	Q I understand that. I'm asking you about	
2	A Go ahead.	
3	Q I'm sorry. I've lost my train of thought.	
4	I'm not asking you about the answers that you got to	
5	this survey. I'm now asking you as an expert in	09:48AM
6	survey methodology if it matters for purposes of	
7	accuracy of the results that you receive that the	
8	information you provide to the respondents is	
9	accurate.	
10	MS. XIDIS: Objection to form.	09:48AM
11	A Again, in many cases information that is	
12	presented in a survey is deemed hypothetical and so	
13	I guess as a matter of principle, no, I guess, it	
14	doesn't matter that the information is accurate.	
15	Q Is there any ethical obligations that a survey	09:49AM
16	designer has to assure that the survey designer is	
17	not misrepresenting something to the survey	•
18	respondents?	
19	A Could you be more specific?	
20	Q Well, you know, let me give you a precise	09:49AM
21	example from this case. In this case in the survey	
22	design, the State of Oklahoma represented to its	
23	citizens that it was going to use an alum program to	
24	treat the problem of poultry litter contamination in	
25	the Illinois River and Tenkiller Lake when in fact	09:49AM

## ROUGH DRAFT, ROGER TOURANGEAU, 4-9-09

		Page 53
1	the State of Oklahoma had no plans to use an alum	
2	program to treat those pollutants at the time they	
3	conducted the survey. Does the survey designer have	
4	any ethical obligation to make sure that the	
5	information that the survey designer is providing to	09:50AM
6	the respondents accurately reflects that fact?	
7	MS. XIDIS: Objection to form.	
8	A What was critical to us was to present a	
9	solution to people that was plausible, that they	
10	could understand and that they accepted, and we	09:50AM
11	presented a solution involving alum and other steps	
12	the State would take, might take to restore the	
13	river and lake to 1960 conditions, and in order to	
14	obtain the information we needed, we presented the	
15	scenario.	09:51AM
16	Q So all that matters is that it has to be	
17	plausible?	
18	MS. XIDIS: Objection to form.	
19	A Well, the various things I said. It has to be	
20	plausible, understood and they have to accept it.	09:51AM
21	Q And that's it in terms of survey design as far	
22	as your ethical obligation?	
23	MS. XIDIS: Objection to form.	
24	Q We gave them /TPH-FBGS so they could make a	
25	decision and we recorded their answers honestly.	09:51AM

## ROUGH DRAFT, ROGER TOURANGEAU, 4-9-09

_		Page 123
1	program was not something /STHAFS even evaluated by	
2	the State's restoration consultant?	
3	MS. XIDIS: Object to form.	
4	A I don't understand that so I doubt it would	
5	have much impact on them. You want to read it	11:54AM
6	again?	
7	Q Yeah. You presented the alum restoration	
8	program as something that would work, that the State	
9	was considering doing in order to solve this	
10	problem. Do you think it would have been important	11:54AM
11	to the recipients to know that the State's	
12	restoration expert had not even evaluated it?	
13	MS. XIDIS: Objection to form.	
14	A I think we've been over this a lost times.	
15	What was important to us about the alum program was	11:55AM
16	that people thought it would solve the problem, that	
17	they understood it and they accepted it. The	
18	State who was it evaluation expert's view of	
19	it, I don't see it as relevant.	
20	Q Would you agree that people's preferences are	11:55AM
21	essentially constructed during the survey interview?	
22	MS. XIDIS: Objection to form.	
23	A I'm not sure what you mean.	
24	Q Do you think that people walked in to the	
25	survey room with an opinion about restoration time	11:56AM